

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated June 8, 2008 within three months. Claims 1-15 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-15. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hanaya, U.S. Patent No. 5,754,258 in view of Tajima, U.S. Patent No. 4,901,147. The Examiner also rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hanaya in view of Tajima and further in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Hanaya fails to disclose muting after the audio signal output from the audio signal switch section is switched, and the Examiner further asserts that the aforementioned feature is disclosed by Tajima (in particular, Fig. 9 and lines 50-61 of column 7 of Tajima).

Applicants assert that Tajima does not explicitly teach muting and un-muting. Consequently, Applicants amend the pending claims to further define the muting (or un-muting) of the first audio signal. In particular, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite “muting . . . until when the audio signal switch section outputs the first audio signal” Support for such a feature can be found in at least Fig. 3 of the original specification.

Applicants assert that such a feature is not disclosed or contemplated by Hanaya, Tajima, nor any combination thereof. In particular, the Examiner has already stated that Hayana fails to teach that any muting is performed. Therefore, Hayana fails to teach or suggest such a feature, and Tajima does not cure such deficiency of Hayana. More specifically, Tajima only teaches that noise is prevented, but Tajima does not teach inhibiting audio signals to be output when selection channels are switched (In contrast, Tajima teaches inhibiting of audio signals when the receiver is inoperative, but not when the selection channels are switched). Specifically, Tajima fails to teach that the first audio signal is muted, and Tajima also fails to teach that the first audio signal is, then, un-muted when the audio signal switch section outputs the first audio signal.

Moreover, Applicants assert that such a specific timing has the advantage of providing “comfortable” listening and not just to prevent noise. Advantageously, the aforementioned feature results in the user being able to listen to the first audio signal in a way such that noise is not

generated when switching between the first audio signal and the second audio signal. Thus, the user does not feel disturbed (e.g., lines 25-32 of page 14 of the specification).

Dependent claims 2-15 variously depend from independent claim 1, so Applicants assert that dependent claims 2-15 are differentiated from the cited references for the same reasons as set forth above, in addition to their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **19-2814**. Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions whatsoever regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 3, 2008

By: 

Howard I. Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com